



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,284	08/09/2001	Daniel Hawiger	600-1-081 CON/CIP	2660
23565	7590	03/28/2006	EXAMINER	
KLAUBER & JACKSON 411 HACKENSACK AVENUE HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			SCHWADRON, RONALD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,284

Applicant(s)

HAWIGER ET AL.

Examiner

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 and 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9, 13-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1644

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/27/05 and 2/14/06 has been entered.

2. Claims 6-9,13-21 are under consideration.

3. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). A computer readable form (CRF) of the sequence listing was submitted. However, the CRF could not be processed by the Scientific and Technical Information Center (STIC) for the reason(s) set forth on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report.

Failure to comply with these requirements will result in ABANDONMENT of the application under 37 CFR 1.821(g). Direct the reply to the undersigned. Applicant is requested to return a copy of the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report with the reply.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 6-9,13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the . . . claimed subject matter", *Vas-Cath, Inc. V.*

Mahurkar, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the applicant had possession at the time of invention of the conjugate recited in the claimed method.

The instant claims recite use of an antiDEC antibody which binds human DEC-205. The term human DEC-205 would appear to encompass full length human DEC-205 as well as mutants and variants or alleles of said human protein (for example see specification, page 28 of parent application 09/586704). However, only full length murine DEC-205 protein is disclosed in the specification of the parent application. The sequence listing discloses two peptides derived from human DEC 205 of 30 and 25 amino acids respectively. However, human DEC-205 contains approximately 1800 amino acids. There is no disclosure in the specification of the identity of the approximately 1750 other amino acids or purified human DEC-205.

Thus, whilst the specification of parent application 09/586704 discloses murine DEC-205 protein, the term human DEC-205 would appear to encompass full length human DEC-205 and undescribed mutants and variants or alleles of said human protein. Thus, the claims would encompass use of antibodies which bound full length human DEC-205 as well as undescribed mutants and variants or alleles of human DEC-205. Regarding claim 18, in the absence of human DEC-205, it would not be possible to establish which antibodies reacted with human DEC-205.

In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, *id.* at 1240. The Federal Circuit has held that if an inventor is "unable to envision the detailed constitution of a gene so as to distinguish it from other materials. . .conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred", *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Attention is also directed to the decision of The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated:

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. Thus, as we have previously held, a cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name "cDNA," even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by means of the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA. See *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

Regarding applicants comments and the Nussenzweig declaration, the cloned human DEC-205 sequence referred to is not disclosed in the specification of the instant application. Regarding the amended claims, human DEC-205 is approximately 1800 amino acids in length. The recitation in the claim of a 30 or 25 amino acid sequence derived from said molecule in itself does not provide written description of a molecule that is almost 1800 amino acids in length. The claims encompass use of antibodies which bind any immunogenic epitope on the approximately 1775 undisclosed amino acids of DEC 205 and the specification does not disclose the identity of said amino acids or disclose purified human DEC-205 protein. Regarding Figure 6 in parent application 09/586704 (and the reference to said Figure in pages 10 and 56 of the specification), said Figure refers to experiments performed in mice, not humans. Regarding claims 18-21, said claims still require use of human DEC-205 to determine if the antibodies cross react with human DEC-205.

Regarding applicants comments about isolating human DEC-205 (wherein isolated human DEC-205 is not disclosed in the specification), attention is directed to the decision of The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated:

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, **not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention**. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.

Regarding applicants comments about *Capon v. Eshhar* (CAFC August, 2005), the invention under consideration in said case was a conjugate that used two known components. The invention was the conjugate, not the components. The components of the conjugate (scFv and transmembrane/cytoplasmic domain of a portion that triggers cell activation) were well known in the art. Thus, their invention was a conjugate using components well known in the art. Thus, said decision is not relevant to the claims under consideration wherein Human DEC-205 was not known in the art (it had not been isolated or sequenced).

6. Claims 6-9,13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.


There is no support in the specification for the recitation of "human DEC-205 protein comprising an amino acid sequence as set forth in SEQ ID 7" in claim 6/13. Whilst the specification discloses SEQ ID NO 7 as a peptide derived from DEC 205, there is no disclosure in the specification as originally filed of a DEC-205 protein comprising said peptide wherein the molecule could have any amino acids in association with the aforementioned sequences recited in the claim. There is no written description in the specification as originally filed for the scope of the claimed invention (e.g. the claimed invention constitutes new matter). Regarding the various cited passages of the specification, none of the passages disclose human DEC-205 protein comprising an amino acid sequence as set forth in SEQ ID 7 in claim 6/13. Whilst the

Art Unit: 1644

specification discloses SEQ ID NO 7 as a peptide derived from DEC 205, there is no disclosure in the specification as originally filed of a DEC-205 protein comprising said peptide wherein the molecule could have any other amino acids in association with the aforementioned sequences recited in the claim.

7. No claim is allowed.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800-1600

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1644

Notice to Comply	Application No. 09/925284	Applicant(s) Hawiger et al.	
	Examiner Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1644	

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

Applicant must file the items indicated below within the time period set the Office action to which the Notice is attached to avoid abandonment under 35 U.S.C. § 133 (extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a)).

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to the final rulemaking notice published at 55 FR 18230 (May 1, 1990), and 1114 OG 29 (May 15, 1990). If the effective filing date is on or after July 1, 1998, see the final rulemaking notice published at 63 FR 29620 (June 1, 1998) and 1211 OG 82 (June 23, 1998).
- ☐ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☐ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☒ 7. Other: see enclosed communication

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216 or (703) 308-2923

For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212 or 308-2923

PatentIn Software Program Support

Technical Assistance.....703-287-0200

To Purchase PatentIn Software.....703-306-2600

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR REPLY

STIC Biotechnology Systems Branch

CRF Problem Report

The Biotechnology Systems Branch of the Scientific and Technical Information Center (STIC) experienced a problem when processing the following computer readable form (CRF):

Application Serial Number: 09/925,284
Filing Date: 08/09/04
Date Processed by STIC: 12/30/2006

STIC Contact: Mark Spencer: Telephone: 571-272-2510; Fax: 571-273-0221

Nature of Problem:

The CRF (was):

- ☐ (circle one) Damaged or Unreadable (for Unreadable, see attached)
☒ Blank (no files on CRF) (see attached)
☐ Empty file (filename present, but no bytes in file) (see attached)
☐ Virus-infected. Virus name: _____ The STIC will not process the CRF.
☐ Not saved in ASCII text
☐ Sequence Listing was embedded in the file. According to Sequence Rules, submitted file should **only** be the Sequence Listing.
☐ Did not contain a Sequence Listing. (see attached sample)
☐ Other: _____

**PLEASE USE THE CHECKER VERSION 4.2.2 PROGRAM TO REDUCE ERRORS.
SEE BELOW FOR ADDRESS:**

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/checker/chkrnote.htm>

Applicants submitting genetic sequence information electronically on diskette or CD-Rom should be aware that there is a possibility that the disk/CD-Rom may have been affected by treatment given to all incoming mail.

Please consider using alternate methods of submission for the disk/CD-Rom or replacement disk/CD-Rom.

Any reply including a sequence listing in electronic form should NOT be sent to the 20231 zip code address for the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and instead should be sent via the following to the indicated addresses:

1. EFS-Bio (<<http://www.uspto.gov/efb/efs/downloads/documents.htm>> , EFS Submission User Manual - ePAVE)
2. U.S. Postal Service: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
3. Hand Carry, Federal Express, United Parcel Service, or other delivery service (EFFECTIVE 01/14/05):
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Mail Stop Sequence, Customer Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

Revised 01/24/05